

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the final Office Action mailed June 28, 2010.

The final Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 5-11 over Fuhrmann in view of WIPO Patent Document No. WO 0205610 to David (David) under 35 USC §103(a).

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner asserts that Fuhrman's Fig. 1 shows an electronic device housing 1 with a closed casing since external wall element 14 at least partially covers housing wall 5, which has also a closed rim 6 (external wall element 14 is asserted to be equivalent to "essentially closed casing (410), as claimed), and that David teaches a removable framing of an electronic unit/hollow only circumferentially closed rim (that is, David's panel [110] as shown in Fig. 1, and described at page 2, lines 19-30).

The Examiner further asserts that Fuhrman discloses a detachable external wall element 14 is adapted to overlie a portion of the housing (col. 6, lines 44-49), the external wall element 14 being sized and shaped to at least partially cover the housing upon attachment thereto, that same limitation is found at col. 5, lines 47-50) and that David teaches framing panel [110] comprises a hollow only circumferentially closed rim (that is, David's panel [110] as shown in Fig. 1, and described at page 2, lines 19-30).

The Examiner then concludes that it would have been obvious to use a removable frame that covers only a circumferential edge as taught by David

(panel [110]) with Fuhrman's external wall element 15 since Fuhrman's external wall element 14 may be sized and shaped at least partially to cover housing 1 upon attachment thereto.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, applicants elect to amend independent claim 1 to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art. In particular, claim 1 defines that the closed casing 410 of the discussion unit 10 has an additional, separate, narrow, circumferentially closed edge 424 as a separate element, and the hollow only circumferentially closed rim 42 is removably mounted to the closed casing 410 to cover only the narrow circumferentially closed edge 424 of the closed casing 410.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found at page 7, lines 2-3 and 15-16, and is seen in Fig. 3.

As explained before and emphasized herein above, the David reference disclosed a display device with a removable panel [110] mounted to cover and overlap outer perimeter portions of a display device to create an aperture for better viewing. The David reference does not have any separate narrow circumferentially closed edge in the closed casing (removable panel [110]), and in the David reference there is no hollow only circumferentially closed rim which is removably mounted to cover only the additional separate narrow circumferentially closed edge of the closed casing, as now required by amended independent claim 1.

That is, the David reference does not disclose the new features of the present as defined in amended independent claim 1, so that its combination with the Fuhrmann reference also would not lead to the applicants' invention as claimed, and claim 1 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art, and allowed, therefore.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,  
/Michael J. Striker/

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233